

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10, 12-14, and 17-33 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 14, 21, 27, 31, and 33 are amended. Claim 11 is cancelled. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the standing claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Data and Computer Communications, Fifth Edition, William Stallings, 1997 ("Stallings") in view of USPN 6,711,167 to Ikeda ("Ikeda"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

According to the MPEP, three basic criteria must be met to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See MPEP 706.02(j).

The Office Action has failed to meet the criteria for obviousness as recited above that the reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations and that the references must provide some suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the references to arrive at the claimed subject matter. Stallings fails to teach or suggest all the features recited in the claims, as amended. Furthermore, Stallings fails

to provide some suggestion or motivation to modify the techniques disclosed by Stallings in an attempt to arrive at the claimed invention. The combination of Ikeda with Stallings fails to overcome this shortcoming. The combination of Gai with Ikeda and Stallings also fails to overcome this shortcoming

As the Office Action correctly states: "Stalling [sic] does not specifically disclose a virtual interface VI work queue." The Office Action further states that "Ikeda discloses an ATM apparatus in which a cell buffer is used for temporarily holding data of a received IP packet, and is used by a sending/receiving controller for generating an ATM cell after referring to a VC table (see lines 47-48, 53-57, col. 12)." "Ikeda further discloses a VC table is holding data indicating the relation between an IP address and VCI/VPI of ATM cells (descriptors about VI work queue, see lines 49-52, col. 12)." Office Action, Page 3. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 1-5 define over Stallings and Ikeda. The relevant citation at Ikeda discloses a technique to convert IP packets to ATM cells. Claims 1-5 each recite the feature of "at least one virtual interface (VI) work queue comprising descriptors to describe data to be transmitted and to describe where to store received data." An example of a "VI work queue" may be a VI work queue as described in the Virtual Interface (VI) Architecture Specification, Version 1.0, December 16, 1997 ("VI Architecture Specification"). Specification, Page 6: Lines 5-8 and Page 7: Lines 16-29, for example. Ikeda does not mention the use of a VI work queue in any context and does not teach or suggest a "work queue comprising descriptors to describe data to be transmitted and to describe where to store received data." Further, the use of VCI/VPI identifiers is a standard ATM technique to connect a pair of ATM nodes, and has no relation to a VI

work queue comprising descriptors to describe data to be transmitted and to describe where to store received data as recited in the claimed subject matter. Therefore, Stallings and Ikeda, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest every feature recited in claims 1-5. Applicant further submits that neither reference provides the necessary suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the references to arrive at the subject matter recited in claims 1-5. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the obviousness rejection with respect to claims 1-5.

Claims 6-10 and 12-13 also define Stallings in view of Ikeda. Claims 6-10 and 12-13, as amended, each recite "a virtual interface (VI) work queue pair to establish a VI channel with the remote node of the local network, wherein the work queue pair comprises descriptors to describe data to be transmitted and to describe where to store received data." As previously discussed with respect to claims 1-5, Stallings and Ikeda, whether taken alone or in combination, fails to disclose, teach or suggest this feature. The use of VCI/VPI identifiers disclosed in Ikeda is a standard ATM technique to connect a pair of ATM nodes, and has no relation to a VI work queue comprising descriptors to describe data to be transmitted and to describe where to store received data as recited in the claimed subject matter. Therefore, Stallings and Ikeda taken alone or in combination fail to disclose, teach or suggest every feature recited in claims 6-10 and 12-13. Applicant further submits that neither reference provides the necessary suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the references to arrive at the subject matter recited in claims 6-10 and 12-13. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the obviousness rejection with respect to claims 6-10 and 12-13.

Claim 11 is cancelled. Therefore, the obviousness rejection with respect thereto is rendered moot.

Claims 14 and 17-20 also define over Stallings and Ikeda. Claims 14 and 17-20, as amended, each recite the language "using a work queue pair to establish a connection-oriented virtual interface (VI) channel in a network, wherein the work queue pair comprises descriptors to describe data to be transmitted and to describe where to store received data." The use of VCI/VPI identifiers disclosed in Ikeda is a standard ATM technique to connect a pair of ATM nodes, and has no relation to a VI work queue comprising descriptors to describe data to be transmitted and to describe where to store received data as recited in the claimed subject matter. Therefore, Stallings and Ikeda taken alone or in combination fail to disclose, teach or suggest every feature recited in claims 14 and 17-20. Applicant further submits that neither reference provides the necessary suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the references to arrive at the subject matter recited in claims 14 and 17-20. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the obviousness rejection with respect to claims 14 and 17-20.

Claims 15 and 16 were previously cancelled. Therefore, the obviousness rejection with respect thereto is rendered moot.

Claim 27 defines over Stallings and Ikeda. Claim 27, as amended, each recite the language "establishing a virtual interface (VI) channel between a first node and each of a plurality of other nodes in the network using a work queue pair, wherein the work queue pair comprises descriptors to describe data to be transmitted and to describe where to store received data." A "VI channel" refers to a virtual interface channel as defined, for example, in the VI Architecture Specification. As previously discussed, Stallings and

Ikeda, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest a "VI channel" as recited in the claimed subject matter. Applicant further submits that neither reference provides the necessary suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the references to arrive at the subject matter recited in claim 27. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection with respect to claim 27.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 14-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stallings in view Ikeda and further in view of USPN 6,697,360 to Gai ("Gai"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 14 defines over Stallings in view of Ikeda and further in view of Gai. Claim 14, as amended, recites the language "using a work queue pair to establish a connection-oriented virtual interface (VI) channel in a network, wherein the work queue pair comprises descriptors to describe data to be transmitted and to describe where to store received data." As previously discussed, Stallings and Ikeda, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest this feature. The combination of Gai with Stallings and Ikeda fails to overcome this shortcoming. Therefore, Stallings, Ikeda, and Gai, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest every feature recited in claim 14. Applicant further submits that none of the references provide the necessary suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the references to arrive at the subject matter recited in claim 14. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection with respect to claim 14.

Claim 15 was previously cancelled. Therefore, the obviousness rejection with respect thereto is rendered moot.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 21-26 and 28-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stallings in view of Gai. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 21-26 define over Stallings in view of Gai. As discussed with reference to claim 27, claims 21-26 and 28-33 also use a "VI channel." According to the Office Action, Stallings discloses that "each ATM cell contains virtual channel identifiers (establishing a connection-oriented VI channel between first node and each of the one or more nodes.)" Office Action, Page 6. As stated previously, a virtual channel identifier is not a "VI channel" or used to create a "VI channel" as recited in the claimed subject matter. Rather, a virtual channel identifier is a standard identifier used to set up an ATM connection. A virtual channel identifier as used in ATM does not relate to a "VI channel." The combination of Gai with Stallings fails to overcome this shortcoming. Applicant further submits that none of the references provide the necessary suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the references to arrive at the subject matter recited in claims 21-26 and 28-33. Therefore, Applicant respectfully request removal of the obviousness rejection with respect to claims 21-26 and 28-33.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-10, 12-14 and 17-33 recite novel features not shown by the cited references. Further, Applicant submits that the above-recited novel features provide new and unexpected results not recognized

Application No. 09/599,000  
Amendment Dated 4/25/05  
Reply to Office Action of 1/25/2005

by the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims are not anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the cited references.

It is believed that claims 1-10, 12-14, and 17-33 are in allowable form.  
Accordingly, a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited.


The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 724-933-3387 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

s/John F. Kacvinsky/s  
John F. Kacvinsky, Reg. No. 40,040  
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on: April 25, 2005.

  
Deborah L. Higham

4-25-05  
Date

Dated: April 25, 2005

12400 Wilshire Blvd., 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025